

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
09/775,141 01/31/2001		Delane Robert Hewett	MCS-059B-00	7735		
27662 7	12/03/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
LYON & HARR, LLP			HENEGHAN, MATTHEW E			
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 800 OXNARD, CA 93036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
,			2134	2134 DATE MAIL ED: 12/02/2004		
	4		DATE MAILED: 12/02/2001			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		09/775,14	1	HEWETT ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Matthew H	leneghan	2134				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).								
Status								
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>31 January 2001</u> .								
, —	a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This action is non-final.							
,								
Dispositio	on of Claims	•						
<ul> <li>4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>								
Application	on Papers							
10) 🖾 -	The specification is objected to by the Example drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2001 is Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the confine oath or declaration is objected to by the	/are: a) acce the drawing(s) b prection is require	e held in abeyance. Seed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 Cl	FR 1.121(d). \			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachment								
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	O-152)			

Art Unit: 2134

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-23 have been examined.

### **Priority**

2. The instant application claims priority to U.S. Patent Application No. 60/237,067, filed 30 September 2000.

#### **Drawings**

- 3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "345" has been used to designate both the Company A image and the address in figure 3.
- 4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "355" points to the automatically generated Company A web page in figure 3, but it described as the Company A address in the specification.
- 5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: item "335" on p. 29, line 26.

Art Unit: 2134

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: item "340" in figure 3.

7. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 3

8. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,887,133 to Brown et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,336 to Schneider et al.

Regarding claim 1, Brown discloses a document generator wherein undesired portions (frames) in a document are automatically located by a system located on the Internet (see column 3, line 54) based upon a determination by a proxy server (see column 3, line 66 to column 4, lines 6). The determination is further based upon the layout of the intermediate document (see column 4, lines 42-49), which is then delivered to the user's controller (see column 4, lines 53-57), where it can be further updated based upon the user profile.

Brown also discloses the use of HTML, a scripting language, for all functionality.

An HTML-generated document retrieved from the Internet is, by definition, a web page (see column 6, line 44 to column 7, line 66).

Though insecure communications in a secure setting are considered in the art to be undesirable. Brown does not consider security considerations.

Schneider discloses a distributed access system wherein security levels are used in Web page construction (see column 45, lines 47-61), and further discloses the raising of different trust levels in a group of objects to the highest trust level being used (see column 10, lines 12-19). Schneider further notes that since security adds overhead, an access filter should neither require nor provide more security than is necessary (see column 5, lines 41-52).

Art Unit: 2134

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Brown by updating insecure portions of a document, normalizing the security level to the highest level, as disclosed by Schneider, as a filter should neither require nor provide more security than is necessary.

As per claim 2, a network address (the entry point) is used as an identifier (see Brown, column 4, lines 27-31).

As per claim 3, HTML is a type of script.

As per claim 4, the HTML script is generated on the remote server.

As per claim 5, the script is then downloaded to the client.

As per claims 6, 7, 9, the web page swapping mechanism can automatically reside on the client (see Brown, abstract).

As per claim 8 and 18, Brown discloses that the dimensions of a substitute document be made according to a specification (see Brown, column 9, lines 55-57).

Regarding claim 10, the script must necessarily reside in a computer-readable medium, such as RAM, before being used.

As per claim 11, the intermediate web page contains variable parameters, such as the location of the document portion to be called (see Brown, column 8, lines 28-36).

As per claims 12-15, the web page may vary depending upon the caller (see Brown, column 8, lines 37-67).

As per claim 16, the HTML script generated has no mandatory fields that are client-specific; therefore, it is also usable by other clients.

Art Unit: 2134

Regarding claim 17, Brown discloses the use of user profiles for determining swaps, but does not suggest that users should be organized according to their security levels (see Brown, column 10, lines 25-32).

Schneider discloses the organizing of users by access level (see Schneider, abstract), as this is part of an access policy that determines which users may be given access to information (see Schneider, column 5, lines 65-66).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the invention of Brown by using user group access levels, as disclosed by Schneider, as this is part of an access policy that determines which users may be given access to information.

Regarding claims 19-22, Brown supports all HTML functionality. Applet support is a standard HTML function.

Regarding claim 23, Schneider, as cited above, also considers paths (entry points) in determining security states.

#### Conclusion

- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- U.S. Patent No. 5,701,342 to Anderson et al. discloses the consideration of security levels in document construction.

Application/Control Number: 09/775,141 Page 7

Art Unit: 2134

U.S Patent No. 6,546,397 to Rempell discloses a system for constructing web pages with security considerations.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew E. Heneghan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3834. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, and Friday from 8:30 AM - 4:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse, can be reached at (571) 272-3838.

#### Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Art Unit: 2134

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MEH MEH

November 26, 2004

andrew Caldwell
Andrew Caldwell

Page 8